DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 113 HE 003 272

AUTHOR Wolosin, Myrna A.
TITLE Survey of Honors Program Graduates Between 1967-70.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. Bureau of Educational Studies and Testing.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 41p.; Indiana Studies in Prediction No. 19

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; College Graduates; *High Achievers; *Higher Education; Honors Classes; *Honors Curriculum; *Student Characteristics; *Superior Students; Talented Students

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to do a follow-up of some of the graduates of the honors program at Indiana University, to explore their current activities and career involvements, and to obtain an assessment of the honors program that is mediated by intervening experience and a sense of perspective of the students' college years. Results of the study show that: (1) 72.5% of the graduates involved are now attending or have attended and completed graduate or professional school and 87% of those students received some form of financial aid; (2) 77% of the respondents who are employed hold jobs in professional or technical categories; (3) income levels are uniformly low, with 70.8% earning $5,000 a year or less; (4) respondents consider themselves to be politically independent, and 70.7% vote regularly; (5) the respondents' evaluation of the honors program is uniformly positive with degree of certainty varying by major area; (6) honors program graduates felt that they were well prepared for their current activities; and (7) 75% of the respondents felt that their honors work was superior to their other work at Indiana University. (HS)

ED 066113

AUG 0 2 1972

INDIANA UNIVERSITY / 1972

Survey of Honors Program Graduates Between 1967-70

INDIANA STUDIES IN PREDICTION

NUMBER NINETEEN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE003 272

Bureau of Educational Studies and Testing

SURVEY OF HONORS PROGRAM GRADUATES BETWEEN 1967-70

by

Myrna A. Wolosin

INDIANA STUDIES IN PREDICTION NO. 19

Bureau of Educational Studies and Testing
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
The Problem	1
Background Information	1
Procedure	3
Sample	4
Results	5
I. Basic Data	5
II. Current Activities	10
III. Evaluation of the Honors Program . . .	21
Summary	34

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Percent of completed questionnaires by year degree was granted	5
2.	Number of potential respondents by degree year	6
3.	Percent of students entering the honors program each year	7
4.	Involvement with the honors program by year of entry into the Honors Division	8
5.	Major area by year of entry into the Honors Division	9
6.	Enrollment in graduate or professional school by sex of respondent	11
7.	Graduate degree expected by sex of respondent	12
8.	Form of financial aid received in graduate or professional school by sex and year of entry into the honors program	13
9.	Percent of respondents in each job category by sex of respondent	15
10.	Length of time percent of respondents expect to remain in current jobs	16
11.	Percent of respondents considering their jobs to be mostly routine work	17
12.	Percent of respondents in each income category	18
13.	Comparison of political party preferences of college graduates in percentages	20

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

Table		Page
14.	Students' retrospective evaluation of the honors course	21
15.	Students' evaluation of the quality of teaching in the honors courses	22
16.	Ratings of preparation given by the honors program for current studies or job	23
17.	Respondents' feelings of how well they are qualified for current jobs or studies in comparison to colleagues	24
18.	The role of the honors program in helping respondents develop the ability to analyze and synthesize new material	25
19.	The role of the honors program in helping respondents develop flexibility of thought and action	26
20.	The role of the Honors Division in helping respondents develop creative problem-solving ability	27
21.	Percentage of respondents agreeing or disagreeing that "honors seminars should have fewer students"	29
22.	Percent of respondents agreeing or disagreeing that "my faculty advisor and I had a good rapport"	30
23.	Percent of respondents agreeing or disagreeing that "there were a variety of interesting topics from which to choose"	31
24.	Respondents designation of the most valuable experience in the honors program	33

SURVEY OF HONORS PROGRAM
GRADUATES BETWEEN 1967-70

The Problem

It has been stated that the objective of education at the university level ought to be "to develop people as individuals" (Sanford, 1967). Following logically that objective, one comes to the conclusion that special kinds of opportunities and programs must be made available to students with unusual potential and capabilities. Such programs have existed at Indiana University under the direction of the Honors Division for several years. The purpose of this study is to do a follow-up of some of the graduates of the honors program, to explore their current activities and career involvements, and to obtain an assessment of the honors program that is mediated by intervening experience and a sense of perspective of the students' college years.

Background Information

Channels of entry into the Honors Division are varied. Some students are invited to participate in the Honors Division on the basis of outstanding high school performance and high scores on either the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or the American College Test (ACT). These students enter the Honors Division in the freshman year, are given special advisors, and

are encouraged to take honors seminars and separate sections of the introductory courses. Their identification with the honors program begins quite early in their college careers and can be credited to the fact that each member of this group has already proved himself capable of high academic achievement.

A second group of students who were not identified prior to entering college may request entrance into the Honors Division on the basis of their first year's work in college. A few of these students may have been invited to join the Honors Division previously and declined the invitation. In some respects these students differ from the former group. First, the have actively sought out an attachment to the Honors Division, and secondly, they have quite recently demonstrated to either themselves or the University a capacity for excellence.

The third channel of entry into honors work is through a student's major department. In either the second semester of the sophomore year or the first semester of the junior year a student may apply to his major department for acceptance into a departmental honors program. These programs usually include independent study, research, seminars and tutorials. The specific requirements for each department differ somewhat, but typically the program culminates in the senior year with a written thesis.

For many students the entrance channels merge into one, and they may progress through four years of honors work, first under

the auspices of the Honors Division, and finally in their major department. Other students join the honors group at later points in their careers, thus having a lesser degree of involvement with the honors program. Any student who has been in the Honors Division or in a departmental honors program and does not wish to continue may drop out at any time. In this respect the channels are always open.

Finally, though we speak in general of an Honors Division, or honors program, it must be realized that there is not one program as such, but rather a series of opportunities that may be organized and combined in unique ways to adapt to each student's needs and further his intellectual development.

Procedure

The name of every student who had completed an undergraduate degree in the Honors Division between 1967 and 1970 was obtained from the Honors Office. There were 321 such students over the four-year span. The Alumni Office could supply addresses for all but 27 of the graduates. Questionnaires were therefore mailed to 294 honors graduates. The mailing, in addition to the questionnaire, included a letter from the director of the Honors Division requesting the student's cooperation and an addressed stamped envelope for returning the questionnaire to the proper office.

Four weeks after the first mailing a second letter and questionnaire were sent to each of the graduates requesting him

to respond if he had not already done so, or to ignore the mailing if he had previously returned the completed questionnaire.

The questionnaire consisted of 68 specific questions with added space for any general comments that the respondent wished to make. The questionnaire was developed with the aid of the Honors Division and covered a wide range of the graduates' current activities as well as a retrospective evaluation of the honors program. It was pretested on a small sample of graduates. The responses were coded by two graduate assistants. One question was not applicable to any respondent and was therefore not coded. Intercoder reliability on the forced-choice questions was virtually 100%. The reliability on the five open-ended questions dropped to 89%. All data were keypunched and analyzed using the Indiana University's Research Computing Center's version of the Yale Table Programs for questionnaire data. Except where specifically noted, all data are presented in precentage form.

Sample

Of the 294 questionnaires mailed, five were sent to graduates who had in fact not been identified with the honors program and 22 were returned as undeliverable. Therefore the number of potential respondents dropped from 294 to 267. The total number of questionnaires returned in completed form was 186, or 69.6%. Questionnaires returned after the analysis of the responses was begun were not included.

Results

I. Basic Data

Students receiving degrees in 1967 were less likely to respond to the questionnaires than any other group.

Table 1. Percent of Completed Questionnaires by Year Degree was Granted

Degree year	Number of potential responses	Number of completed questionnaires	Percent of completed questionnaires by degree year
1967	64	37	57.81
1968	60	42	70.00
1969	75	52	69.33
1970	73	53	72.60

A possible explanation for this difference is that these students, having been out of school longer, have moved more often and are merely harder to reach.

Table 2. Number of Potential Respondents by Degree Year

Degree year	Number of graduates	Number of undergraduate questionnaires	Potential respondents
1967	76	12	64
1968	74	14	60
1969	87	12	75
1970	84	11	73

Table 2 indicates that there were no differences in accessibility between the graduates of any given year. A second feasible explanation may be that the passing of time lessens one's ties to his college years, making the request for information less compelling as well as dimming his recollections and sense of involvement. This hypothesis is unfortunately untestable.

Males accounted for 52% of the sample, females 48%. Forty-two percent were married and 55% were single. The age range was quite small with a total of 68% of the respondents between 23 and 25 years. Twenty-one percent of the respondents were under 22 and 11% were over 26. It is especially important to remember that this is a young population when looking at figures on their current income levels, which on the whole are quite low for college graduates (Withey p. 56).

All of our respondents had been enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences. Many of them, 28%, had been contacted by the Honors Division prior to entering the University, and they had begun taking Honors Division work in their freshman year. A total of 40% entered the Honors Division as juniors and had absolutely no contact with the honors program until they selected a major and begun work in their major departments. Freshman and junior years are the times when entry into the Honors Division is greatest. Very little attempt seems to be made to reach students who do well as freshmen and involve them with the honors program the following year.

Table 3. Percent of Students Entering the Honors Program Each Year

Year	Percent
Freshman	27.96
Sophomore	17.74
Junior	40.86
Senior	13.44

The amount of involvement each student had with the Honors Division is significantly different for those students entering as freshmen or sophomores and those entering as juniors or seniors.

Table 4. Involvement with the Honors Program by Year of Entry into the Honors Division

Amount of involvement	Entering as Fresh. or Soph.	Entering as Juniors or Seniors	X^2	Total
No answer	1.2	6.0		3.6
Core or Fresh. work only	2.4	0.0		1.1
Honors work in major dept.	13.1	11.0		12.0
Honors work in major and other depts.	7.1	2.0		4.3
Thesis and work in major dept.	40.5	52.0		46.7
Thesis and work in major and other depts.	32.1	12.0		21.2
Thesis or independent research only	3.6	17.0		10.9
			$25.71 < .001$	

The later students enter the program, the smaller is the chance that they will do honors work outside their major departments. For example, 17% of those later entering students are involved with the Honors Division only at the time they do a thesis or independent research, compared to 3.6% of those early entrants. Also, 39% of those who enter the program early take honors work in departments outside their major departments, while only 14% of those entering later become involved with honors work outside their major. It seems unfortunate that these students who are bright and capable are uninvolved in a process that could perhaps broaden their interests and the base of their knowledge.

Choice of major area also is somewhat related to the year of entry into the program.

Table 5. Major Area by Year of Entry into the Honors Division

Major area	Entering as Fresh. or Soph.	Entering as Junior or Senior	I^2	Total
Physical and Biological Sciences	28.4	17.7		22.6
Social Sciences	38.3	34.4		36.2
Humanities	33.3	47.9		41.2
			4.67< .10	

Though we did not have enough respondents in one sample to group students by their major departments, we did have a sufficiently large sample to group by major areas; 22.6% were enrolled in departments categorized as physical or biological sciences, 36.2% were in the social sciences and 41.2% in the humanities. Those who entered the Honors Division as juniors and seniors are over-represented in the humanities and under-represented in physical and biological sciences, while the opposite is true of students who entered as freshmen or sophomores; they are over-represented in the physical and biological sciences and under-represented in the humanities.

II. Current Activities of Honor Graduates

Many of the questions concerning the value of honors programs in general and the program at I.U. specifically can be partially answered by looking at the activities of these former students. Success of a program is extremely difficult to assess. The criterion for success may range from the very specific and objective, for example, grade point average or income level after commencement; to those that are subjective and nebulous, like overall satisfaction with the college experience. The approach taken here is to avoid setting any criterion and instead catalogue current activities in three areas: academic involvement, employment, and community activities on a personal and political level.

Our respondents are very much involved with academic pursuits.

Seventy-two percent of the sample, or 135 respondents are either currently enrolled in graduate or professional school, or were enrolled and have already completed their graduate training.

Table 6. Enrollment in Graduate or Professional School by Sex of Respondent

Enrollment	Male	Female	X^2	Total
Currently enrolled	72.2	53.9		63.4
Were enrolled and have completed advanced training	6.2	12.4		9.1
Were enrolled and dropped out	9.3	15.7		12.4
Never enrolled	12.4	18.0		15.1
			6.90<.10	

There is a sex differential for graduate school enrollment. Only 66.3% of the females are currently enrolled or have completed training compared with 78.4% of the males. Females also drop out out school slightly more often than males, and when they do enroll in degree programs, their goals, as judged by the type of degree they expect to receive, or have received, are very different from the goals of their male counterparts.

Table 7. Graduate Degree Expected by Sex of Respondent

Degree	Male	Female	χ^2	Total
Master of Science, Arts, Education, or Social Work	9.6	44.4		25.8
Doctor of Philosophy or Education	55.4	40.3		48.4
Doctor of Law	19.3	5.6		12.9
Doctor of Medicine or Dentistry	12.0	1.4		7.1
Other	2.4	2.8		2.6
No degree	1.2	5.6		3.2
			34.0<.001	

Females are noticeably under-represented in professional schools, law, medicine and dentistry. Only 7% of the females are enrolled in these schools as compared to 31.3% of the males. Females are over-represented in Master's Degree programs, with 44.4% expecting a Master's Degree compared to only 9.6% of the males.

We have no serious indication of the reasons for these sex differences. They are differences that would, according to traditional sex role theory be expected. It may be that the cause for these differences in enrollment are internal--such as differential ambition or achievement needs, or external--such as sex

discrimination on the part of graduate or professional schools. That the differences in enrollment in graduate school are not due to differential capabilities can be seen from some of our other data. Males and females differ--but not significantly--on the numbers of academic awards, honors or prizes they have received, on the number of publications they have, on the innovations or discoveries they have made in their respective fields, and on their reception of financial aid in graduate school.

A total of 87.2% of our respondents enrolled in graduate school are receiving financial aid.

Table 8. Form of Financial Aid Received in Graduate or Professional School by Sex and Year of Entry into the Honors Program

	Male N=70	Female N=64	X^2	Entering in Fresh. or Soph. N=64	Entering in Junior or Senior N=70	X^2	Total
Fellowship	53.4	43.8		42.2	55.7		49.3
Assistantship	11.4	20.8		17.2	14.3		15.7
Research grant	4.3	4.7		7.8	1.4		4.5
Teaching internship	7.1	10.9		6.3	11.4		9.0
Student loan	22.9	20.3	3.09	26.6	17.1	6.84	21.6

The form of the aid ranges from full fellowships to student loans. It is interesting to note that students who entered the honors program as juniors or seniors received more straight fellowships, more teaching internships, and fewer loans than early entrants into the honors programs. This may reflect expertise in one's field that develops from a heavy concentration in a major area, as was earlier found to be the case with these late entrants into the Honors Division.

There are also some differences between males and females on the particular forms of financial aid they receive, though there are no significant differences in number of students of each sex receiving aid—85.5% of the males compared to 89.0% of the females. Males receive assistantships and teaching internships. The number of student loans taken out by each sex was roughly equal.

A second broad area of interest is the employment opportunities available for honors graduates. A total of 52.7% of the respondents hold either full or part time jobs. Remembering that 63.4% of the respondents are currently enrolled in graduate school, it is evident that some of the respondents who are in school are also employed.

Table 9. Percent of Respondents in Each Job Category by Sex of Respondent

Job Category	Male	Female	χ^2	Total
Professional or Technical	84.2	71.4		77.0
Farmer	0.0	0.0		0.0
Manager	0.0	2.0		1.1
Clerical	10.5	14.3		12.6
Sales	2.6	4.1		3.4
Craftsman or Foreman	0.0	0.0		0.0
Operative	0.0	0.0		0.0
Housewife	0.0	6.1		3.4
Service Worker	2.6	2.0		2.3
			3.95	

The jobs held by our respondents tend to be overwhelmingly technical and professional, though once again there is a tendency for the jobs of our male respondents to fall into this category more often than females' jobs. There was not a single respondent employed at manual labor, and very few, 3.4%, were employed as sales personnel. Clerical workers were our second largest category. Though the questionnaire did not probe into the problem of job choice, many of our respondents did indicate that the jobs they held were viewed only as a means of earning enough money to put either

themselves or their husbands through graduate school. That most of these jobs are considered temporary can be seen from a later question asking the length of time respondents expected to remain in their current jobs.

Table 10. Length of Time Percent of Respondents Expect to Remain in Current Jobs

Time in years	Total
Under 1 year	7.0
1 - 3 years	84.0
3 - 5 years	4.0
Over 5 years	5.0

Over 90% of the respondents who are employed do not expect to remain in those jobs more than three years. Categorization of jobs can only reveal minimum of information about the way in which a person must function on a day to day level in his job. More informative are questions concerning the person's perceptions of job demands, and his subsequent job preformance. Slightly more than half of our sample, 54.5%, answered affirmatively to the question, "Have you been singled out for more than adequate performance of your job?" A total of 76.3% agree that there are opportunties for them to be creative or innovative

in their job performance, but only 25.5% seem to have taken advantage of those opportunities and actually been responsible of innovative methods or techniques.

Table 11. Percent of Respondents Considering Their Jobs to be Mostly Routine Work

	Male	Female	X^2	Total
Mostly Routine	46.0	25.5		36.1
Not Mostly Routine	54.0	74.5		63.9
			$3.10 < .10$	

Males and females differ significantly on their perceptions of their jobs as being mostly routine work, with females less often feeling themselves caught up in routine chores. This is counter to traditional views of sex roles, where women are thought to be more often employed in highly routinized jobs.

The income or earnings of our sample are quite low compared to a national sample of college graduates where the median income for respondants who had completed a bachelor's degree was over $11,200 (Withey, p. 57).

Table 12. Percent of Respondents in Each Income Category

Dollar income	Male	Female	X^2	Total
Below 3,000	43.7	49.4		46.4
3,000 - 5,000	28.7	19.8		24.4
5,000 - 7,000	11.5	6.2		8.9
7,000 - 9,000	6.9	16.0		11.3
9,000 or Above	9.2	8.6	6.13	8.9

Our respondents clustered in the lower end of the income scale, with the largest proportion of respondents, 46.4%, earning under $3,000 yearly. In combination with the youth and inexperince of our respondents, both of which act to depress income, is the fact that many are employed only part time, their main committments being to finish graduate school. It must also be remembered that our respondents graduated from college between 1967 and 1970 and have only been out of school between one and four years. This is clearly not the time of maximum earning power for most of them, and at this point in their lives projections of future incomes are not really possible.

A third broad area of interest is the extent to which our graduates are involved in the communities. Crude indications of

involvement may be assessed from both political behavior and altrustic activity. In addition to attempting to keep up academically in their own fields, an overwhelming majority, 87.1%, also try to be aware of what is happening in the world by either reading a newspaper, or watching news on television, or both.

In comparison to a national sample (Withey, p. 115), of voter turnout in the 1968 presidental election, our respondents are less likely to exercise their rights to vote.* Eighty-nine percent of the college graduates in the national sample reported voting in the 1968 election, while only 70% of our respondents answered that they voted regularly. It must be recognized that the questions asked in the national survey and in ours are not the same. We attempted to assess tendency to vote, while the national survey assessed actual voting behavior in specific elections.

Our sample also differs slightly from the national sample (Withey, p. 113), in their party preferences. In the national sample more college graduates considered themselves Republicans than Democrats, while in our sample the reverse was true. In both samples there were more voters who considered themselves Independents than either other category, but in our sample more than half of the voters identified themselves as Independent compared to only 38% nationally.

* The 1968 national election study was done by the Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.

Table 13. Comparison of Political Party Preferences of College Graduates in Percentages

	Democrat	Independent	Republican
1968 National sample *	27.0	38.0	35.0
1971 Sample of honors graduates	30.%	57.5	7.5

* The source of this data is the 1968 national election study, Survey Research Center, The University of Michigan. It is reported in Withey, et. al. A Degree and What Else, McGraw Hill, 1971.

In addition to voting tendency, a measure of political behavior is actual involvement in political campaigns. About 30% of our sample answers affirmatively to the question, "Have you actually campaigned for any political candidate at either the local, state or national level"? In the same national survey mentioned above, only 10% of the college graduates surveyed in 1968 worked for either a party or a candidate. Perhaps our sample is displaying the intensity of youth, while the national sample which includes college graduates of all ages, has no such bias.

Political activity is one way for people to become tied into their local communities. There are may other ways, one of which is altruistic activity on behalf of community organizations. The range of activities is quite wide, from working in a hospital or library, to tutoring school students or running a thrift shop.

Despite the possibilites for endless variety, a very small proportion of our sample, 15%, was involved in any type of volunteer activity. In contrast to that figure, when respondents were asked if they donate their time or money to a charity 54.3% said, "yes," with females significantly more likely to respond affirmatively then males.

III Retrospective Evaluation of the Honors Program

Most of our respondents, having been out of school between one and five years, can look back at their experiences in the Honors Division and evaluate them with some degree of perspective. End of the semester course ratings may often be influences by momentary pressures of grades, papers, and multiple boads of course work, while in a retrospective evaluation only general and diffuse memory of the course stands out.

Table 14. Students' Retrospective Evaluation of the Honors Course

Rating Category	Male	Female	X^2	Total
Outstanding	31.6	42.9		36.9
Good	52.6	50.0		51.4
Average	8.4	3.6		6.1
Poor or very poor	7.4	3.6		5.6
			4.45	

Both the honors courses and the quality of teaching in those courses were rated in the upper end of the scale. In rating courses, males tended to use the top category less often then females, and the bottom category more often. Whereas 42.9% of the females thought their courses were outstanding, only 31.6% of the males thought theirs were; and while 3.6% of the females rated their courses as poor or very poor, 7.4% of the males used that rating category. A total of 88.3% of all respondents rated their courses as good or outstanding, with only 5.6% rating them as poor or very poor.

The ratings for the quality of teaching in the Honors Division are higher than those for the courses.

Table 15. Students' Evaluation of the Quality of Teaching in the Honors Courses

Rating Category	Male	Female	X^2	Total
Outstanding	40.0	42.9		41.3
Good	46.3	51.2		48.6
Average	10.5	3.6		7.3
Poor or very poor	3.2	2.4		2.8
			3.37	

Male - female differences in rating are not as evident with roughly the same proportion of each sex using the top and bottom categories and variability between the sexes coming in the middle of the scale. Ninety percent of the respondents remembered the teaching as being good or outstanding, and only 2.8% rated the quality of teaching as poor or very poor.

A third set of variables related to the evaluation of the honors program is the extent to which graduates of the program feel prepared and qualified to perform either in their places of employment or in an academic setting.

Table 16. Ratings of Preparation Given by the Honors Program for Current Studies or Job

Rating Category	Total
Very good	29.3
Good	46.0
Average	14.9
Poor	5.2
Very poor	4.6

In terms of preparation for current studies or job, roughly 30.0% of the respondents felt that the preparation given them by the honors program was very good, and only 4.6% felt that they were

very poorly prepared. A total of 75.3% rated their preparation as good or very good.

In addition to an individual sense of being well prepared respondents were asked to compare themselves to their colleagues and peers and assess how well qualified they are for their present activities.

Table 17. Respondents' Feelings of How Well They are Qualified for Current Jobs or Studies in Comparison to Colleagues

Rating Category	Male	Female	X^2	Total
Very well qualified	26.0	39.5		32.4
Well qualified	58.3	47.7		53.3
Average	14.6	11.6		13.2
Below average	1.0	1.2		1.1
			3.82	

Only 1.1% of the respondents felt that their qualifications were below average, and 32.4% categorized themselves as very well qualified. The majority of respondents, 53.3%, were above average, but nonetheless in the middle of the scale. Females more often than males categorized themselves as very well qualified.

Aside from the general evaluations of courses and teaching faculty, and the more subjective dimensions of self-preparedness

and qualification, we can ask specifically about some of the skills and abilities students have or have not aquired as undergraduates and the role the honors program has played in helping in their development. Most of the data to be presented here are analyzed separately for social sciences majors, majors in physical and biological sciences and respondents who majored in the humanities The logic behind this separation of majors is that the combinations of skills and abilities emphasized in various disciplines are likely to be different.

We first asked about the role of the honors program in helping students develop the ability to analyze and synthesize new material. Sixty-nine percent of the total number of respondents felt that the role of the honors program was important, and 12.9% felt that it was unimportant, but the respondents in different major areas differ significantly on this dimension.

Table 18. The Role of the Honors Program in Helping Respondents Develop the Ability to Analyze and Synthesize New Material

	Phys. or Biol. Science N=38	Social Science N=64	Humanities N=69	χ^2	Total N=171
Important	76.3	57.8	75.4		69.0
Moderate	10.5	20.3	20.3		18.1
Unimportant	13.2	21.9	4.3		12.9
				$11.35 < .025$	

Many more respondents in the social sciences characterized the honors program's role as unimportant, and fewer regarded it as important in comparison to the other two major areas. It may be that respondents in the social sciences find that there is an emphasis on this type of skill in their non-honors as well as in their honors courses. This may not be true of students in the humanities.

The second variable in which there were significant differences between majors was the role of the honors program in helping students develop flexibility of thought and action.

Table 19. The Role of the Honors Program in Helping Respondents Develop Flexibility of Thought and Action

	Phy. or Biol. Science N=38	Social Science N=64	Humanities N=69	χ^2	Total N=171
Important	68.4	49.4	49.3		57.3
Moderate	15.8	18.7	42.0		27.5
Unimportant	15.8	21.9	8.7		15.2
				14.43 <.01	

Once again, more students in the social sciences felt the honors program to be unimportant in this dimension. On the other hand,

68% of the respondents in physical or biological sciences felt the role of the Honors Division to be important compared to only 49% in each of the other two major areas. There were also significant differences between the major areas on the question of the role of the honors program in helping develop creative problem solving ability.

Table 20. The Role of the Honors Division in Helping Respondents Develop Cr tive Problem-solving Ability

	Phy. or Biol. Science N=38	Social Science N=64	Humanities N=69	X^2	Total N=171
Important	76.3	48.4	46.4		53.8
Moderate	10.5	29.7	42.0		30.4
Unimportant	13.2	21.9	11.6		15.8
				$15.08 < .005$	

Seventy-six percent of the respondents in physical or biological sciences felt that the honors program was important, while only 48.4% or 46.4% of respondents in the social sciences or humanities felt that the honors program played an important role in their development. There was a larger precentage of respondents in the social sciences, 21.9%, who felt that the Honors Division played

an unimportant role in developing creative problem solving ability.

The most uniformly unfavorable rating of the Honors Division in this set of evaluative questions was with regard to the role of the Honors Division in helping in the development of social maturity. A total of 52.9% of the respondents felt that the role of the Honors Division was unimportant, and this was true regardless of major areas.

A total of 60.8% of the respondents felt that the honors program played an important role in helping them develop skills to evaluate data, compared to 16.4% who felt it was unimportant. There was a slight tendency for majors in physical and biological sciences to more often rate the role of the honors program on this dimension as important than respondents in other major areas.

Fifty-two point nine percent of all of the respondents felt the honors program was important in helping them develop a logical approach to problem solving, while 16.5% thought it was unimportant. Fifty-seven point four percent said the program was important in their developing a sense of antonomy and 58.2% thought the honors program was important for developing intellectual integrity.

Besides assessing the specific skills that the honors program was important in fostering, respondent were asked to agree, state no opinion, or disagree with a series of statements about the honors program and about their experiences at the university. Seventy-eight point four percent of the respondents agreed that the honors program gave them adequate opportunities to pursue their

their own interests, and this seemed to be more true of respondents in the social sciences and the humanities than of respondents in physical and biological sciences. Seventy-four point seven percent agreed that the honors courses were superior to other courses at Indiana University, while 16.1% disagreed with the statement. Slightly more than 80% of the respondents agreed that they had more contact with faculty members than non-honors students, and 73.7% felt that they were treated like responsible members of the university community. Eighty-three percent agreed that they learned a great deal from honors courses, and 76.7% agreed that they were proud of this identification with the honors program.

The size of honors seminars was satisfactory to most respondents, with only 14.8% of the total agreeing that seminars should have had fewer students.

Table 21. Percentage of Respondents Agreeing or Disagreeing That "Honors Seminars Should Have had Fewer Students".

	Phy. or Biol. Science N=38	Social Science N=64	Humanities N=69	χ^2	Total N=171
Disagree	30.8	53.1	41.1		43.2
No opinion	61.5	31.3	41.1		42.0
Agree	7.7	15.6	14.8		14.8
				$10.05 < .05$	

Respondents in the three major areas felt differently about the size of the seminars however, with students in the social sciences most likely to be either very satisfied with the size of classes or very dissatified and less likely to have no opinion.

There were also significant differences between major areas on the question of good rapport with the faculty advisors.

Table 22. Percent of Respondents Agreeing or Disagreeing that "My Faculty Advisor and I Had a Good Rapport".

	Phy. or Biol. Science N=38	Social Science N=64	Humanities N=69	X^2	Total N=171
Disagree	64.1	79.7	75.3		74.4
No opinion	28.2	6.3	15.1		14.8
Agree	7.7	14.1	9.6	$9.80<.05$	10.8

Students in the social sciences clustered at either end of the dimension, with few, 6.3%, in the no opinion category, compared to 28.2% of those in physical and biological sciences having no opinion. Roughly three-fourths of the total number of respondents agreed that their rapport with the faculty advisor was good.

A second dimension on which the Honors Division seemed to be falling behind was in providing enough variety in seminar topics.

Agreement with the statement that "There were a variety of interesting seminar topics from which to choose", dropped to 40%.

Table 23. Percent of Respondents Agreeing or Disagreeing That "There Were a Variety of Interesting Topics from Which to Choose".

	Phy. or Biol. Science N=38	Social Science N=64	Humanities N=69	X^2	Total N=171
Agree	38.5	49.2	34.2		40.6
No opinion	43.6	17.5	23.3		25.7
Disagree	17.9	33.3	42.5		33.7
				13.13<.01	

There were significant differences between majors in this, with respondents in both social studies and the humanities having higher proportions of students both agreeing and disagreeing more often with the statement. Students in the physical and biological sciences would fall in the middle of a rank ordering of agreement that there was variety, and at the bottom of a ranking of dissagreement with the statement. They also tended to have no opinion much more often then the other two major groupings.

Most of the students who graduate in the Honors Division

complete an honors thesis in their senior year. Only 16.8% of our respondents did not write an honors thesis. Of those that did write a thesis, only 27.5% consulted with their thesis advisor very often and a full 34% consulted with him only occasionally. The frequency of such contact may not be as important as the intensity of the contact. Very few thesis advisors, 7.8% were described as not helpful, while 59.5% were designated very helpful.

We asked each student to look back over all his experiences in the Honors Division and designate which of those experiences were most valuable to him. Many of our respondents, 19.7% felt that two or more experiences were equally valuable. For those that did choose only one, honors courses in one's own field of study were at the top of the list, with independent study a close second. It is interestinging to note that more students entering the program as juniors and seniors found that independent study was the most valuable experiences, while honors courses in one's own field were more valuable to thise who entered as freshmen or spphomores. Writing a thesis is third in line of importance regardless of the year of entry into the honors program, and all of the other possible experiences fall in way behind the above three. It may be that the above three are not just the most valuable experiences, but the most common as well.

Table 24. Respondents Designation of the Most Valuable Experience in the Honors Program

	Entering in Fresh. or Soph. year	Entering in Jr. or Sr. year	χ^2	Total
Honors courses in your own field	29.6	21.6		25.3
Honors courses outside your field	8.6	3.1		5.6
Thesis	17.3	15.5		16.3
Independent study	16.0	29.9		23.6
Teaching intership	1.2	5.2		3.4
Summer research grant	4.9	7.2		6.2
More than one of the above	22.2	17.5	$10.09 < .10$	19.7

If any one question could be used to indicate the success or failure of the honors program, perhaps it is the question concerning what the respondent would do if he were again faced with the decision to join or not to join the Honors Division. We asked our respondents, "If the decision were to be made again, would you join the honors program?" A total of 93% responded "yes," they would join again, and only 7% said "no." By this criterion, the honors program has done quite well.

Summary

It would be interesting to be able to form a composite picture of the typical honors-program graduate. We would start off by noting the youth of the sample and their relatively high level of intelligence and motivation, but beyond that, the diversity among the group is so great in terms of their current activities and interests that the picture of a typical student would be inappropriate

More accurate would be a brief review of some of our major findings:

1. Most of the graduates involved in our study, 72.5%, are now attending or have attended and completed graduate or professional school. Eighty-seven percent of those students recieved some form of financial aid.

2. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents who are employed hold jobs in professional or technical categories.

3. Income levels are uniformly low, with 70.8% earning $5,000 a year or less.

4. Respondents consider themselves to be politically independent, and 70.7% vote regularly.

5. The respondents evaluation of the honors program is uniformly positive with diversity of degree of positivity varying by major area.

6. Honors program graduates felt that they were well prepared for their current activities.

7. Seventy-five percent of the respondents felt that their honors work was superior to their other work at Indiana University.

REFERENCES

Nevitt, Sanford, Where Colleges Fail, San Fransciso: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1967

Withey, Stephen B., A Degree and What Else? A report prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, McGraw Hill, 1971.